

**City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes
March 15, 2011
Pre-meeting – 6:00 p.m. - Regular Session – 7:00 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers**

Attendance:

Planning Commission

Dale Kehl, Chair
Kristie Overson
Anna Barbieri
Steven Fauschou
Ernest Burgess
Ted Jensen
Garl Fink
Dan Fazzini, Jr. (Alternate)

Community Development Staff

Mark McGrath/Director
Michael Meldrum/Principal Planner
Jean Gallegos/Admin Asst/Recorder
Excused: Dan Udall/City Planner

PUBLIC: Brent Overson

19:04:57

WELCOME: **Commissioner Kehl** assumed duties as Chair and welcomed those present, explained the process to be followed this evening and opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. He outlined the items on the Consent Agenda and asked if there were anyone in the audience wishing to speak to any of them or if there were any changes deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission. There being none, **Commissioner Kehl** asked for a motion regarding the Consent Agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

Agenda/File #	Application	Applicants	Action
1. 3H11	Home Occupation – Social Counseling	Colleen Norris 4730 S Meadow wood Way	Approved with staff recommendation.

MOTION: **Commissioner Jensen** – I move for approval of the Consent Agenda consisting of Item #1, File #3H11 – Home Occupation for a Social Counseling business, with staff recommendations.

SECOND: **Commissioner Barbieri**

Commissioner Kehl restated the motion to approve the Consent Agenda consisting of Item #1 a home occupation for a social counseling business.

VOTE

Commissioner	Vote	Commissioner	Vote	Commissioner	Vote
Fauschou	AYE	Jensen	AYE	Kehl	Chair
Fink	AYE	Barbieri	AYE	Fazzini	Alternate
Overson	AYE	Burgess	AYE		

Motion passes 6 to 0.

SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

2. **Review/Approval of the Land Development Code** (Mark McGrath, Michael Meldrum and Don Adams)

2.1. **Mr. Adams** opened the discussion by stating that after reviewing this document for four months, Staff is now down to three problems in the ordinance. The first was the agricultural question and on Chapter 11, Page 11, under Farm Animals and Household Pets, it reads A. Farm Animals. 1. Designation of Appropriate Zone Districts. The words “property owners” have been crossed out and it now reads, “In any R-1-40, R-1-30, R-1-20 District.” The remainder of the sentence would be deleted. Section 2 – Procedure for Designation, which talks about the five contiguous lots over an acre and a half, would be deleted. It basically states these animals are legal in R-1-40, 30 and 20 Districts. In Paragraph 3 (now changed to 2), the ratio still remains the same. Regarding chickens, Section A will be re-titled to read “backyard chickens” and later on the term “backyard chickens” will be added into Section B. It would literally be just swapping titles.

- At this point, **Mr. Adams** acknowledged Jean Ashby in the audience, stating she had provided all the administrative support in the creation of this document. Members of the Commission publicly thanked her for doing an excellent job.
- Commissioner Kehl** asked which section then deals with chickens and **Mr. McGrath** replied that it was Chapter 11, #3 on Page 12. **Mr. Adams** advised that section would be renamed as “Backyard Chickens” and then on Page 12, Item #3 it will be re-entitled to read, “Outdoor Animal Domicile Structure”, which should rectify the chicken issues. The next issue is Section 13A-21-11 “Private Streets/Lanes”. Recommendation would be to allow Mr. McGrath to develop the Exception Standards to include public right-of-way width of 50’ but construction of the street profile to

change based upon its ability to serve the projected amount of traffic, public safety and pedestrian safety. [19:13:25](#) By adding those three provisions, Staff would be directed to create those standards and have those complete before it appears in front of the City Council.

- **Commissioner Overson** asked about farm animals saying that her understanding was that any lot smaller than R-1-20 cannot have any farm animals to which **Mr. Adams** advised that was correct. That it must be a half acre or larger to have farm animals, with the exception of the backyard chicken ordinance provisions. **Commissioner Overson** continued by saying that would mean with a half acre or larger they can have farm animals and for lots smaller than half acre all that is allowed is chickens (with a permit) and household pets. **Mr. Adams** said that was done partly for the neighborhood continuity but also for the health of the animal. The smaller the lot is the more difficult it is to take care of them appropriately.
- **Commissioner Jensen** said that he had a question from the last session where making the façade a certain height above the roof was discussed. **Mr. Adams** said that is now addressed in Chapter 27 and Chapter 37.
- **Commissioner Overson** stated that anything Commissioners may find to be missing can be filtered back into this document before it goes to the City Council for approval. After approval, any modifications would be done by amendment. [19:21:01](#) In the "W" definitions, page 75, midway down it says water check and then it says, "See irrigation" – the "i" on irrigation needs to be capitalized. **Mr. Adams** said he appreciated that and asked Commissioners if they have other non-substantial changes like that to please call him and he will make sure they are done.
- **Commissioner Faurschou** wondered if all the zone designations have all been changed. **Mr. Adams** said that he believed that has been completed.
- **Mr. Adams** said to accommodate the change in animal allowances, see Chapter 7, Page 3 in the chart, third one down, "Animals, (Household Pets or Farm)", has an "S" designation of Chapter 7 that states they are allowed in R-1-40, R-1-30 and R-1-20 zones. **Commissioner Overson** asked if that then shouldn't be an "N" for anything below R-1-15. **Mr. Adams** said that is handled in Chapter 11, which is special uses, where it tells you that you can only have the farm animals in the three largest residential zones. So by default, they are not allowed in the smaller zones but the pets are still handled in Chapter 11. [19:25:22](#)
- **Commissioner Kehl** opened the public hearing portion of the meeting and asked if anyone wished to speak. Mr. Overson asked to be heard regarding commercial design standards.

2.2 **SPEAKING:** **Brent Overson** [19:29:06](#) gave a short introduction and showed a slide presentation. He addressed some items in the new ordinance regarding building materials. He asked that different construction elements are being included and felt there should be a maximum amount of certain types of materials allowed, with at least two or three types being allowed and with no more than 50% of the building being one type of material. He felt strongly that the CMU architectural styling should be added. In his opinion, it lasts forever and is very attractive when done right. He felt that if it was not added to the new ordinance, that fact might be deemed to be arbitrary. He added that having design standards would certainly not solve all problems but at least they are a negotiating tool to be used with developers. If there is nothing in place and the City wants to require a builder/developer certain criteria without a written ordinance it could be overruled in a court case. Things to be given consideration are parking setbacks, screening, landscaping, signing, connectivity, lighting and security. As far as the building consideration is concerned, first of all site considerations is something that almost every City has. They all have site plan ordinances in effect. But rarely do cities look at buildings and how they are constructed. In the building considerations, things such as orientation of the building with respect to adjacent properties and the streets, what type of building materials are to be used, lighting, entrances, the articulation (the variation in the facades), the fenestration which is the utilization of windows to enhance the design features, signs, recesses and facades. Site considerations are typically addressed in City ordinance. Screening is a very important element with respect to garbage containers, utilities, etc. Landscaping provides for additional articulation of the building and can integrate existing natural features in the layout of the development. Signage is very important and should compliment the building design. Connectivity – automobiles should connect with adjacent commercial buildings and parking should have internal circulation routes. There should be connectivity with respect to the pedestrians that utilize those commercial facilities. Lighting should compliment architecture and landscaping. There should be unified exterior lighting vision and it also provides for safe vehicular and pedestrian access to minimize adverse impacts on adjacent properties. Security is very important and is becoming a very important part of consideration of designs in site plans, etc. Provides for natural surveillance, well defined territories so intruders would stand out. Controlled access, maintenance and lighting are also very important issues. Building considerations are: Do the fronts orient to the street, do they frame a corner. Building materials: Typical appropriate are full veneer brick, quarry stone, architectural CMU and cultured stone. Typically inappropriate are metal or vinyl siding, smooth face concrete or all cinderblock painted. The main entrance should face the primary street to be obvious and inviting. There should be multiple entrances, especially with buildings that are greater than 50,000 square feet. Examples of how other cities regulate entrances – they provide canopies or porticos, overhangs, recesses, projections, arcades, raised cornice parapets over the door, peaked roof forms, arches, outdoor patios, display windows, architectural details such as tile work and moldings integrated in the building structure and design, with integral planters or wing walls incorporate landscaped areas in other places for sitting. Buildings should have a human scale which should be inviting to pedestrians and should not be overwhelming to the surrounding areas and amenities. Should be compatible with surroundings. Materials, colors and surrounding environment should be compatible. [19:52:12](#)

2.3 **Commissioner Kehl** thanked Mr. Overson for his presentation and reopened the meeting for further discussion.

2.4 **DISCUSSION:** **Mr. Adams** [20:10:53](#) asked that before there is a motion would it be possible to get a quick raise of hands on the additions or subtractions on Page 3.1, meaning did the Commissioners want to add on Page 3.1 under discouraged building material, painted brick or cinder block (all said yes). Did they want to add under a preferred building material Atlas block?

(All said yes). Did they want to establish under Section B an upper limit of a single quality building material – meaning no 100% brick? **Commissioner Fink** asked if that meant a certain percentage. **Mr. Adams** said yes, an upper limit – and asked if they wanted to establish an upper limit and not to exceed, meaning that 100% brick would not be allowed. (All were okay with leaving it like it is). **Commissioner Kehl** added that should be made part of the motion. **Commissioner Jensen** commented that as he was looking through the zoning map, he noticed that S.O.B.s (Sexually Oriented Businesses) are only allowed in the industrial districts, of which there is only one small area in the City and it presently has a single facility on it. **Mr. McGrath** wondered if Commissioner Jensen were asking if he felt that was too overly restrictive, to which, **Commissioner Jensen** replied in the affirmative. **Mr. Adams** said that technically a portion of the back side of the Sorensen Park area could be rezoned as ID, which would eliminate any potential problem. That any change would not be handled through a text change but rather through the zoning map change.

[20:12:25](#)

- 2.5 **MOTION:** **Commissioner Jensen** [20:13:20](#) I would like to make a motion to forward to the City Council approval of the Land Development Code, File #5Z10, [20:13:20](#) with the following changes: (1) 13A11-03 – Farm Animals, Chickens, etc.; (2) 13A21-11 – Private Streets and Lanes; (3) As discussed tonight, Chapter 37, Section 3.1; (4) with the understanding that anything we discover that is of a non-substantial nature can be made before it goes to the City Council. **Commissioner Kehl** asked Commissioner Jensen to repeat his motion. **Commissioner Jensen** – The first one is 13A11-03, Farm Animals or chickens; the second one was private lanes and streets; the third one was Chapter 37, Section 3.1 on building materials/standards and the fourth one would be that the Commission or Staff can still make typographical or non-substantial changes between now and the time it goes to City Council.
- 2.6 **DISCUSSION:** **Commissioner Fink** – Mr. Chairman, on Section 3.1, I thought we were going to include CMU and exclude having painted brick. Are we not going to call that out or is it just assumed? **Commissioner Jensen** - This includes the three items that Mr. Adams brought up and we essentially voted yes on. [20:15:46](#) **SECOND:** **Commissioner Fink**
- 2.7 **Commissioner Kehl** - All in favor of forwarding this document to the City Council with a favorable recommendation as outlined with applicable changes please say AYE.

VOTE					
Commissioner	Vote	Commissioner	Vote	Commissioner	Vote
Faurschou	AYE	Jensen	AYE	Kehl	Chair
Fink	AYE	Barbieri	AYE	Fazzini	Alternate
Overson	AYE	Burgess	AYE		
Motion passes 6 to 0.					

DISCUSSION ITEM

3. Discussion and initial review of the proposed zoning map. (Mark McGrath, Michael Meldrum and Don Adams) [20:17:28](#)

3.1 **Mr. Meldrum** conducted this discussion. For the review of the proposed map and Commissioners sat at tables in the middle of chambers in order to be able to lay out the maps for better viewing capability for everyone there. There was an extensive amount of discussion took place and many questions were asked about specific zoning designations being assigned to specific locations and possible repercussions someday for doing so. This will be heard in final version on April 12, 2011 before the Planning Commission and on April 13, 2011 before the City Council for review/approval. **Mr. McGrath** expressed his appreciation for the work the Commissioners and Staff have put into this effort.

3.3 This item was for discussion only. No motion is required.

OTHER BUSINESS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: By motion of **Commissioner Barbieri** the meeting was adjourned at 9:11 p.m. [21:11:15](#)

Respectfully submitted by:

Jean Gallegos, Admin Assistant/Recorder for the
Planning Commission

Minutes were approved in meeting held on April 12, 2011.